

**Chesapeake Forest Citizens Advisory Committee  
Meeting  
Wednesday, October 23, 2002  
Worcester Room, Commons Building, Salisbury University**

**Committee Members:**

Ellen Lawler, Salisbury University  
Jan Graham, Sierra Club  
Jeff Leitner, The Fund for Animals  
Pete Alexander, Glatfelter Pulp Wood  
Lori Lilly, UMES  
Cecelia G. Dennis, Rural Legacy  
Skip Jones, Parker Forestry Services, Inc.  
Sen. J. Lowell Stoltzfus, Maryland Senate  
Sandy Coyman, Worcester County  
Russ Brinsfield, Mayor/Vienna & Director, Wye Research Center  
Natalie Chabot, Dorchester County Tourism

**Absent:**

Keith Underwood, Environmental Consultant  
Delegate Rudolph Cane  
Annette Cottman  
Steven C. Goss, Maryland Sportsmen Association

**MD DNR Staff:**

John F. Wilson, Resource Planning  
Raj Williams, Resource Planning  
Steven W. Koehn, Director, Forest Service  
Kip Powers, Forest Service  
Michael Schofield, Forest Service/Chesapeake Forest Project Manager  
Holly May, Forest Service/Chesapeake Forest

**Public Attendees:**

Bill Loffler, Smurfit-Stone Container Corp.  
Neil Sampson, Vision Forestry, LLC  
Larry Walton, Vision Forestry, LLC  
Col. Louis L. Murray Jr. (ret.)  
Evan Smith, The Conservation Fund  
Paul Eriksson

**Meeting Summary:**

The meeting started with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) approving the minutes from the September meeting. The September meeting minutes are posted on the Chesapeake Forest website at: [www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/Chesapeakeforests](http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/Chesapeakeforests).

Michael Schofield presented the Chesapeake Forest Manager's Report, which included brief descriptions of the following items:

- 450 acres of first and second thinnings completed (80% first thinnings, 20% second thinnings),
- 400 acres of mid-rotation aerial spraying completed and sample plots were also established to test varying concentrations of herbicide,
- 25 of 29 miles of boundary marking completed,
- Nine new gates installed and 11 miles of roads brushed and cleared,
- ID Team review completed for the FY04 Annual Work Plan,
- Conducted field tour with DNR Secretary Fox, and
- Monitoring Team working on GIS grid layer and determining sampling strata.

Steven Koehn presented the committee with the Trends in Maryland's Forest brochure. John Wilson introduced Evan Smith from The Conservation Fund.

John Wilson initiated the Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) discussion with a brief discussion of major objectives as identified in the Introduction (Part 1) of the SFMP. **Please note: Committee members may submit written comments or recommendations for inclusion in the SFMP to John Wilson at any time.** Please see The Plan Summary handout for the major goals and objectives for Parts 1-6 of the SFMP.

There were several questions concerning Part 2, Resource Characterization. Jeff Leitner asked if, from a management standpoint, there was a reason to separate the forestland into separate tracts. Kip Powers responded that future plans include managing the forestlands as complexes, but that stand/tract records would be maintained for historical purposes. Ellen Lawler, Pete Alexander, and Sen. Stoltzfus questioned "land swaps" of Chesapeake Forest lands and private lands. John Wilson replied that the Department had received more than 100 requests for land deals but no decisions would be made until the SFMP and a natural resource assessment of all Chesapeake Forest lands is complete. At that time, requests would be evaluated to determine if there would be clear benefits to the State, either ecologically and/or economically.

Part 3 of the SFMP described different kinds of management zones on the Chesapeake Forest. Jeff Leitner asked if the Annual Work Plan is submitted for public comment every year. John Wilson responded that the Annual Work Plan must go through an approval process that includes a public comment period. Mr. Leitner requested that interested committee members be kept on the Annual Work Plan email list even after the CAC dissolves. John responded that the Chesapeake Forest website is also a good tool to keep up-to-date on such information.

Ellen Lawler asked if there was a designated recreational zone for the Chesapeake Forest. John Wilson responded that there was not a recreational zone at this time, but that recreational use would be considered when consistent with the other management objectives.

Pete Alexander stated that the term “zones” was not the best choice of words and often carries a negative connotation. Mr. Alexander was also concerned about inflexibility associated with zone designation, with the exception of tangible/physical resources. He felt that zones should include management for the benefit of all natural resources, including timber. Senator Stoltzfus agreed that the term zone implies rigidity. Jeff Leitner commented that the approved wording in the SFMP must be usable 10 years or more from now when another group of managers may be in place. John Wilson replied that the term “zone” was chosen to help identify areas with similar physical characteristics and management objectives that would help guide management decisions. Pete Alexander commented that the term zone moves away from sustainable forestry. John Wilson asked Evan Smith for his comments with regard to zones since he helped play a major role in the development of the SFMP. Evan replied that zone denotes the overriding priority in a physical area, but does not designate what can or cannot be done to manage that area. The group decided they would revisit the zone wording at a future meeting.

Part 4 of the SFMP included guidelines for general forest management. Pete Alexander asked for percentages of even-aged vs. uneven-aged stands. Mike Schofield responded that those percentages would change according to management objectives. Neil Sampson commented that approximately 49,000 acres of forest are under even-aged management. Mr. Alexander commented that it seemed as though the Forest Service was moving toward uneven-aged management via the DFS and FIDS guidelines and that there may be some violation of the seed-tree law. Kip Powers replied that 20-30 percent of a cut area needs to be replanted in pine and that the Forest Service would not be in violation of the seed-tree law. Skip Jones asked if there would be even-aged management in mixed pine-hardwood stands. Mike Schofield replied yes, but with selective harvests in riparian zones. Russ Brinsfield asked if application of nutrients and herbicide was part of the SFMP. Mike responded yes, but DNR is experimenting with lower concentrations of herbicides to control undesirable hardwoods. Lori Lilly asked how herbicide and fertilizer application contributes to sustainability of the forest, since chemicals are not defined as sustainable. Mike Schofield replied that it depends on the definition of sustainability, but that we also consider alternatives such as burning, spot spraying, lower concentrations, etc. Ms. Lilly, Jan Graham, Ellen Lawler and Jeff Leitner stated that they would like to see written language in the SFMP that suggests the Department will minimize the use of herbicides by using lower concentrations of chemicals and other methods of vegetative control (such as fire), whenever possible. John Wilson responded that forest management activities are reviewed by the ID Team and guided by the SFMP.

Jeff Leitner questioned the status of public outreach efforts with private landowners. Steven Koehn responded that field tours, open houses, and technical assistance sessions are available through both Chesapeake Forest staff and county foresters. Jeff Leitner commented that he would like to see a written statement in the SFMP regarding outreach efforts.

The meeting concluded with discussion of Part 4. Parts 5 & 6 will be discussed at future meetings. The next CAC meeting will be held November 20 at Salisbury University and will include committee and public review of the FY04 Annual Work Plan.

**Public Comment Period:**

Col. Murray commented we should be careful of designating zones for management.